


To state a claim for § 1983 relief, Plaintiff must plead that a person or persons, acting under color of state law, deprived him of some right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States. Parratt v. Taylor, 451 U.S. 527, 535 (1981). Yet, a county jail or workhouse is not a person that can be sued under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Rhodes v. McDannel, 945 F.2d 117, 120 (6th Cir. 1991).

Thus, the Plaintiff fails to state a claim under § 1983 against the Defendant Maury County Jail.

As to the individual Defendants, pro se pleadings are subject to liberal construction. Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972). Yet, Plaintiff must plead more than bare legal conclusions. Lillard v. Shelby County Board of Education, 76 F.3d 716, 726 (6th Cir. 1996). Plaintiff must identify the right or privilege that was violated and the role that each defendant played in the alleged violation. Dunn v. Tennessee, 697 F.2d 121, 128 (6th Cir. 1982). A pro se litigant must meet the basic pleading requirements for a complaint in order to state a cognizable claim for relief. Wells v. Brown, 891 F.2d 591, 594 (6th Cir. 1989).

Here, Plaintiff does not make specific allegations of misconduct by Sheriff George and Lt. Wagonschultz. In fact, Plaintiff never mentions these Defendants by name or title in his description of the facts. (Docket Entry No. 1, Complaint at 5). Thus, the Court concludes that Plaintiff fails to state a claim against these Defendants. If a prisoner plaintiff fails to state a claim, the Court must dismiss the complaint *sua sponte*. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2).

An appropriate order is filed herewith.


WILLIAM J. HAYNES, JR.
United States District Judge
7-11-12